UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/796,138	03/10/2004	Takanori Okuoka	119041	2074

25944   7590   10/07/2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 320850
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850

EXAMINER
DICKERSON, CHAD S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/07/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed 9/18/2009 have been fully considered but they
are not persuasive. In Applicant's remarks, the Applicant asserted that the
applied references did not perform the features of (1) *"wherein the job connection*
component includes information designated by a user as to whether an original
print job corresponding to the respective one of the plurality of jobs should be
deleted from in the memory and whether the connected job should be stored in
the memory, when the jobs stored in the memory are selected and generation of
the connected job is instructed" and (2) *"a warning is generated if the user*
designates to delete the respective one of the plurality of jobs from the memory
when the user designates not to store the connected job in the memory". The
Examiner respectfully disagrees with these assertions.

In both references of Nakagiri and Nishikawa, the systems contain the
feature of combining jobs together as a combined job and deleting these jobs as
they are generated for a combined job. In the primary reference of Nakagiri,
figure 21 displays the process of combining jobs[1]. The jobs are combined and
displayed, as illustrated in figures 16-18. In the Nakagiri reference, the system is
able to delete jobs as they are combined, or generated, to form a combined job.
Although the Applicant asserts that the Kato reference does not perform the
above feature, the Examiner believes this feature is taught by both the Nakagiri
and Nishikawa references. Because jobs in a connected job can be deleted from

---

[1] See Nakagiri '440 at col. 20, ll. 54-col. 21, ll. 35.

memory or stored in memory in connection with a combined job, the feature of

designating whether to store a job or delete the job in memory by a user during

the process of generating a combination job is performed.

  In reference to the disclosure of Kato regarding the first feature, it is clear

that the Kato system utilizes a user's input in order for the system to determine

what job to delete in terms of a combined job[2]. For example, in paragraph

[0078], the job common header is used to create the job control block. As

mentioned in the cited in paragraph [0047] of Kato, the user can set printing

conditions that makeup the job common header such as the number of copies as

well as other information such as job number and storage limit information.

When the user combines or connects jobs, the user can then rewrite the header

information that pertains to the combined jobs, which includes information on the

storage limit information that deals with the deletion of the job[3]. Here, in the

system of Kato, the system allows a user to rewrite the header during the job

combination process. With the above information of Kato being combined with

the Nakagiri reference of deleting image data during the combination of image

data, the Examiner believes the claim limitation above (1) is performed.

  Regarding the second (2) asserted claim limitation, the references of

Nakagiri and Nishikawa involve the features of a user designating to delete a job

from memory that is apart of a combination, or connection, job[4]. Even the

---

[2] See Kato '865 at ¶ [0058]-[0073] and [0087].
[3] Id. at ¶ [0058]-[0060].
[4] See Office Action at pages 5 and 6.

reference of Kato involves deleting a job connected to other jobs[5]. However, the

generation of a warning during the deletion of a job is not clearly presented in the

references, but this deficiency is cured by the reference of Abe[6]. Therefore, with

the combination of the above references with the warning generation feature of

Abe, the Examiner still believes the claim limitation regarding the second

assertion (2) is performed and the rejection of the claims is maintained.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to CHAD DICKERSON whose telephone

number is (571)270-1351. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-

6:00pm Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, Twyler Haskins can be reached on (571) 272-7406. The

fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 571-273-8300.

---

[5] See Kato at ¶ [0066]-[0068].
[6] See Office Action at pages 8 and 9.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-

9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

<div style="text-align: right">

CHAD DICKERSON
Examiner
Art Unit 2625

</div>

/Twyler L. Haskins/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625